

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

Carlton Davis,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:15-cv-2739

v.

Mr. Gary Mohr, et al.,

CHIEF JUDGE EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.
Magistrate Judge Kemp

Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff has filed a motion requesting the appointment of counsel. Since this action has not yet progressed to the point that the Court is able to evaluate the merits of plaintiff's claim, the motion for appointment of counsel (Doc. 30) is denied. See Mars v. Hanberry, 752 F.2d 254 (6th Cir. 1985).

Plaintiff also has filed a motion requesting that defendants serve their discovery responses on him at his new address. Defendants have filed a notice representing that they have done so. Plaintiff has not challenged this representation. Consequently, plaintiff's discovery-related motion (Doc. 29) is denied as moot.

Any party may, within fourteen days after this Order is filed, file and serve on the opposing party a motion for reconsideration by a District Judge. 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(A), Rule 72(a), Fed. R. Civ. P.; Eastern Division Order No. 91-3, pt. I., F., 5. The motion must specifically designate the order or part in question and the basis for any objection. Responses to objections are due fourteen days after objections are filed and replies by the objecting party are due seven days thereafter. The District Judge, upon consideration of the motion, shall set aside any part of this Order found to be clearly erroneous or

contrary to law.

This order is in full force and effect, notwithstanding the filing of any objections, unless stayed by the Magistrate Judge or District Judge. S.D. Ohio L.R. 72.4.

/s/Terence P. Kemp
United States Magistrate Judge